

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW GENTER EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Institute For Public Representation

600 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Suite 312 Washington, DC 20001-2075 RECEIVED

Telephone: 202-662-9535

TDD: 202-662-9538 Fax: 202-662-9634

PREPAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

JUN 17 2002

June 17, 2002

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Douglas L. Parker

Hope M. Babcock

Associate Director

Angela J. Campbell Associate Director

Christopher R. Day Lawrence M. Levine Amy R. Wolverton

Sheila A. Bedi

Fellows

Environmental Law Project

Citizens Communications Center Project Michael D. Beach

Director

Marlene Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Re:

Ex Parte Presentation

ORIGINAL

CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200,

95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On June 17, 2002, the undersigned met with Paul Garnett of the Commission's Wireline Competition Bureau to deliver the attached materials, which are being submitted in connection with the Commission's June 21, 2002, meeting regarding possible changes to the universal service contribution methodologies.

Pursuant to the Commission's ex parte rules, an original and 13 copies of this letter and attachment are being filed. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher R. Day

Attachment

Matthew Brill, Office of Commissioner Abernathy cc:

Paul Garnett, WCB

No. of Copies reold

List ASCOE

THE CASE AGAINST CONNECTION-BASED USF ASSESSMENT

Consumers Union
Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel
Consumer Federation of America
Appalachian People's Action Counsel
Center for Digital Democracy
Edgemont Neighborhood Coalition
Migrant Legal Action Program

Written Presentation for FCC Public Meeting

Panel 1: Contribution Assessment Methodologies

June 21, 2002

A Connection-Based USF Fee Violates Section 254(d) of the 1996 Act

- A Connection-Based Fee Eliminates Contribution Requirements for Many Interexchange Carriers
 - Section 254(d) specifically states that "[e]very telecommunications carrier" providing interstate services shall contribute to the fund.
 - The connection-based proposal, however, would allow a number of interexchange carriers to completely avoid any contribution responsibility, in clear violation of Section 254(d).
- A Connection-Based Fee Is Not "Equitable and Nondiscriminatory"
 - Section 254(d) also requires that any USF assessment be "equitable and nondiscriminatory."
 - A connection-based fee levies the same assessment on both "high-end" and "low-use" customers, and plainly discriminates against low-use and low-income customers.

The CoSus Connection-Based Fee Proposal Will Hurt Low-Income and Low-Use Customers

- The Flat \$1.00 USF Connection Fee Proposed By the Coalition for Sustainable Universal Service ("CoSus") Will Disproportionately Harm Low-Income and Low-Use Consumers
 - The CoSus proposal assumes that carriers would add at least a \$0.10 "administrative fee" in addition to the \$1.00 connection-based USF fee. Under this scenario, low-use customers would pay more in "USF recovery" under the connection-based proposal in all but 2 of the 18 calling plans studied. (See Attachment 1).
 - In addition, it is critical to note that the CoSus plan provides no cap for "excess" USF recovery or "administrative fees" that carriers could levy in addition to the proposed \$1.00 connection-based fee. Accordingly, if carriers levied a \$0.25 "administrative fee" in addition to the \$1.00 connection charge, low-use customers would pay more under the connection-based proposal than the currently do in all but 1 of the 18 calling plans studied. (See Attachment 2). Furthermore, if a \$0.51 "administrative fee" is charged, customers would pay more under the connection-based proposal than they do under any of the calling plans studied. (See Attachment 3).
- Even the CoSus statistics note that low-income consumers will pay more under their connection-based USF proposal than under the current revenue-based system. The CoSus data submitted in initial comments admits that 62% of all households with incomes below \$15,000 a year will pay more under the connection-based proposal, and that 58% of households making between \$15,000 and \$30,000 will pay more. (See CoSus Comments, Attachment 2 at 6, Table 1).



Consumer Friendly USF Reform Proposals

- The Basic Revenue-Based USF Assessment System Should Be Retained.
- Current USF "Safe Harbors," Such as the Wireless "Safe Harbor" Should Be Re-Examined in Light of Changing Market Conditions.
- The Commission Should Study Changes to the Current Assessment System That Would Eliminate the USF Assessment "Lag."
- The Commission Should Prohibit Customer "Pass-Through" of Carrier USF Assessments or, In the Alternative, Limit Carrier Recovery to the Actual Amount of the Applicable USF Assessment Factor to Protect Consumers From Abusive Carrier USF Recovery Practices.

ATTACHMENT 1



CURRENT USF COSTS FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL LONG DISTANCE CUSTOMERS

COMPARED WITH ANNUALIZED COST FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS ASSESSED A CONNECTIVITY FEE of \$1.10

and the second		The state of the s		Proposed USF	Total	A	Actual		Current		Current		Total		Actual		Annualized		Annualized			
		Advertised			Connectivity	End-User	- 1	er-Minute	USF		USF			l-User	Per	r-Minute	USF	USF Increase		USF increase		
		Per-Minute	Monthly		Cost Per	Costs For	- 1	Rate For	[1		L	sts For		te For	1	.ow-Use	For	AveUse		
	Plan	Rate	Fee	LEC	Month	29 Minutes	s 2	9 Minutes	29	Minutes	58 I	Minutes	58	Minutes	58	Minutes	Cus	tomers	Cus	tomers		
	One Rate	Í					ł															
	Plus Plan	0.07	\$3.95	11.50%	\$ 1.10	\$ 6.67	<u> </u>	\$ 0.23	\$	0.69	\$	0.92	\$	8.93	\$	0.15	\$	(1.17)	\$	(3.97)		
	Anytime		:																l			
	Advantage																ļ					
	Savings												_						<u>.</u>			
E S	Option	0.07	<u> </u>	9.90%	\$ 1.10			\$ 0.19		0.49	1	0.69		7.70		0.13	\$	1.16		(1.25		
			\$ 5.95			\$ 8.77		\$ 0.30	\$	0.79	\$	0.99	\$	11.00	\$	0.19	\$	(2.40)	\$	(4.81)		
	Anytime	0.07	to	9.90%	\$ 1.10			• • • • •	_	2 22		0.40					١.					
	F	0.010	\$0.00	0.050		\$ 2.23	_	\$ 0.08	\$	0.20	\$	0.40	\$	4.46	\$	0.08	\$	4.67		2.26		
	Everdial1 N/A	0.049	\$0.00	9.25%		\$ 1.55 \$ 1.42		\$ 0.05 \$ 0.05	\$	0.13	\$	0.26	\$		\$	0.05	\$	5.50	\$	3.93		
	IN/A	0.045	\$0.00	8.50%	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.42		\$ 0.05	\$	0.11	\$	0.22	\$	2.83	*	0.05	3	5.75	\$	4.42		
								:														
7	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	6.90%	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.52		\$ 0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	3.04	¢.	0.05		5 00		4 72		
	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	9.25%				\$ 0.05 \$ 0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.26	\$	3.10	\$ \$	0.05 0.05	\$	5.90 5.50	\$	4.73 3.93		
	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	9.90%				\$ 0.05 \$ 0.06	\$ \$	0.16	\$	0.20	\$	3.44	9	0.05	\$	5.22	-	3.36		
		0.054	\$ 2.00	3.3076	<u> </u>	\$ 3.44		\$ 0.12	\$	0.31	\$	0.42	\$	4.68	\$	0.08	\$	3.40	S	2.07		
	N/A	0.039	to	9.80%	\$ 1.10	Ψ 0.44	1	0.12	Ψ	0.01	•	0.72	•	4.00	Ψ	0.00	Ψ	3.40	•	2.07		
		0.000	\$0.00	0.0070		\$ 1.24	1 5	\$ 0.04	\$	0.11	\$	0.22	\$	2.48	\$	0.04	\$	5.75	•	4.42		
			\$ 2.00			\$ 3.66			\$	0.24	\$	0.33	\$	5.18	\$	0.09	\$	4.25	Š	3.07		
	N/A	0.049	to	6.90%	\$ 1.10	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	`		•		Ť		•	00	•	0.00	•	1.20	T	0.0.		
			\$0.00		•	\$ 1.52	1	\$ 0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	3.04	\$	0.05	S	5.90	\$	4.73		
*			\$ 2.00			\$ 3.56	1		\$	0.25	\$	0.35	\$	4.96	\$	0.09	\$	4.03	\$	2.82		
Money	N/A	0.045	to	7.70%	\$ 1.10																	
			\$0.00			\$ 1.41	1 9	\$ 0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	2.81	\$	0.05	\$	5.87	\$	4.67		
			\$ 2.50			\$ 4.31		0.15	\$	0.39	\$	0.53	\$	5.87	\$	0.10	\$	2.42	\$	0.73		
ħ		0.049	to	9.90%	\$ 1.10		1							ļ								
i.	N/A		\$0.00			\$ 1.56		0.05	\$	0.14	\$	0.28	\$	3.12	\$	0.05	\$	5.39	\$	3.70		
tn	N/A	0.069	\$0.00	12%	\$ 1.10	\$ 2.24		\$ 0.08	\$	0.24	\$	0.48	\$	4.48	\$	0.08	\$	4.20	\$	1.32		

ORICINAL

ATTACHMENT 2

CURRENT USF COSTS FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL LONG DISTANCE CUSTOMERS

COMPARED WITH ANNUALIZED COST FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS ASSESSED A CONNECTIVITY FEE OF \$1.25

				Current	1 '	sed USF Total		•		Actual				Current		Total		Actual		Annualized		Annualized	
		Advertised		USF%	Connectivity	1	-User	Per-Minute		USF		USF		End-User		Per	r-Minute	USF Increase		USF Increase			
		1			Cost Per		ts For	1		ſ		I		Co	sts For	Rat	te For	for I	Low-Use	For	AveUse		
	Plan	Rate	Fee	LEC	Month	29 1	Minutes	29	Minutes	29	Minutes	58 I	Minutes	58	Minutes	58	Minutes	Cus	tomers	Cus	tomers		
	One Rate																						
	Plus Plan	0.07	\$3.95	11.50%	\$ 1.25	\$	6.67	\$	0.23	\$	0.69	\$	0.92	\$	8.93	\$	0.15	\$	0.63	\$	_(2.17)		
	Anytime			}	1																		
¥	Advantage	İ				İ						İ											
	Savings											١.									i		
	Option	0.07		9.90%	\$ 1.25	_	5.47	\$	0.19	\$	0.49	\$	0.69		7.70	\$	0.13		2.96	\$	0.55		
	A	0.07	\$ 5.95	0.000		\$	8.77	\$	0.30	\$	0.79	\$	0.99	\$	11.00	\$	0.19	\$	(0.60)	\$	(3.01)		
K.	Anytime	0.07		9.90%	\$ 1.25		0.00		0.00			١,				١.							
	Everdial1	0.040	\$0.00	0.050/	A 105	3	2.23	\$	80.0	_	0.20	_	0.40	\$	4.46	\$	0.08	\$	6.47	\$	4.06		
Address of the control of the later of the control	N/A	0.049 0.045	\$0.00	9.25%			1.55	\$	0.05	\$	0.13	\$	0.26	\$	3.10	\$	0.05	\$	7.30	\$	5.73		
A mi	N/A	0.045	\$0.00	8.50%	\$ 1.25	\$	1.42	\$	0.05	\$	0.11	\$	0.22	\$	2.83	\$	0.05	\$	7.55	\$	6.22		
ne.	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	6 000/	¢ 4.05		4.50	•	0.05	•	0.40	_		•						_			
	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	6.90% 9.25%		\$	1.52	\$	0.05		0.10		0.20		3.04	\$_	0.05	\$	7.70		6.53		
	N/A	0.049	\$0.00	9.25%		\$	1.55 1.72	\$ \$	0.05	\$	0.13	\$	0.26	\$	3.10	\$	0.05	\$	7.30	\$	5.73		
Andrew Commenced	17/2	0.054	\$2.00	9.90%	\$ 1.25	\$	3.44	\$	0.06	<u>\$</u> \$	0.16	\$	0.31	\$	3.44	\$	0.06	\$	7.02	\$	5.16		
	N/A	0.039	\$ 2.00 to	9.80%	\$ 1.25	Ð	3.44	Φ	0.12	Ф	0.31	\$	0.42	\$	4.68	\$	0.08	\$	5.20	Ş	3.87		
	'''^	0.039	\$0.00	9.00%	J 1.25	\$	1.24	\$	0.04	\$	0.11	æ	0.22	ø	0.40	•	0.04	•	7.55	•			
			\$ 2.00			\$	3.66	\$	0.13	\$	0.11	\$	0.22	<u>\$</u> \$	2.48 5.18	<u>\$</u> \$	0.04	<u>\$</u> \$	7.55 6.05	\$	6.22		
	N/A	0.049	to	6.90%	\$ 1.25	Ψ	3.00	Ψ	0.13	Φ	0.24	Ψ	0.33	Φ	3.10	Ф	0.09	Þ	6.05	Þ	4.87		
		0.010	\$0.00	0.0070	Ψ 1.23	\$	1.52	\$	0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	3.04	\$	0.05	\$	7.70		6.53		
Market Market Co. 12, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10			\$ 2.00			\$	3.56	\$	0.12	\$	0.10	\$	0.25	\$	4.96	\$	0.09	\$	5.83	<u>\$</u>	4.62		
1	N/A	0.045	to	7.70%	\$ 1.25	Ψ	0.00	Ψ	0.,2	Ψ	0.23	Ф	0.33	Ф	4.90	Ф	0.09	Ф	5.03	Þ	4.62		
		0.010	\$0.00		1.20	\$	1.41	\$	0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	2.81	\$	0.05	ė	7.67	\$	6.47		
			\$ 2.50			\$	4.31	\$	0.15	\$	0.39	\$	0.53	<u>\$</u>	5.87	\$ \$	0.10	\$	4.22	\$	2.53		
ia		0.049	to	9.90%	\$ 1.25	•	,	Ψ	· · · · ·	•	0.03	Ψ	0.30	Ψ	5.07	Ψ	0.10	Ψ	7.22	₩	2,00		
	N/A		\$0.00	0.0070	,,,,,	\$	1.56	\$	0.05	\$	0.14	\$	0.28	\$	3.12	\$	0.05	\$	7.19	\$	5.50		
		0.069		12%	\$ 1.25	\$.	3.12		
	N/A	0.069	\$0.00	12%	\$ 1.25	\$	2.24	\$	0.08	\$	0.14	\$	0.48	\$	4.48	\$	0.08	\$	6.00	\$	_		

ATTACHMENT 3

CURRENT USF COSTS FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL LONG DISTANCE CUSTOMERS

COMPARED WITH ANNUALIZED COST FOR LOW-USE AND AVERAGE-USE RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS ASSESSED A CONNECTIVITY FEE OF \$1.51

				Current	Proposed USF	d USF Tota		1		Actual		Cur	rent	Current		Total		Actual		Annualized			ualized
		Advertised		USF%	Connectivity	!		Per-Minute		USF		USF		End-User		Per-Minute		USF Increase]			
		Per-Minute	,	& \$0.51	Cost Per	1			1		1		Costs For		sts For	Rate For		for Low-Use		For AveUse			
Promise	Plan	Rate	Fee	LEC	Month	29 1	Minutes	29	Minutes	29	Minutes	58 N	Minutes	58	Minutes	58	Minutes	Cus	tomers	Cust	omers		
	One Rate																						
ATTIES	Plus Plan	0.07	\$3.95	11.50%	\$ 1.51	\$	6.67	\$	0.23	\$	0.69	\$	0.92	\$	8.93	\$	0.15	\$	3.75	\$	0.95		
	Anytime					1												İ		ŀ			
Control of the contro	Advantage															İ							
1992.	Savings					1															1		
MO	Option	0.07		9.90%	\$ 1. <u>51</u>	\$	5.47	\$	0.19		0.49	\$	0.69	-	7.70	\$	0.13	\$	6.08		3.67		
			\$ 5.95			\$	8.77	\$	0.30	\$	0.79	\$	0.99	\$	11.00	\$	0.19	\$	2.52	\$	0.11		
30	Anytime	0.07		9.90%	\$ 1.51			ĺ	i			İ				İ							
			\$0.00			\$	2.23	\$	0.08	\$	0.20	\$	0.40	\$	4.46	\$	0.08	\$	9.59	\$	7.18		
		0.049		9.25%	·	\$	1.55	\$	0.05	\$	0.13	\$	0.26	\$	3.10	\$	0.05	\$	10.42	\$	8.85		
201 49	N/A	0.045	\$0.00	8.50%	\$ 1.5 <u>1</u>	\$	1.42	\$	0.05	\$	0.11	\$	0.22	\$	2.83	\$	0.05	\$	10.67	\$	9.34		
ronie																İ					ĺ		
																•							
	N/A	0.049		6.90%			1.52	\$	0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	3.04	\$	0.05	\$	10.82		9.65		
-	N/A	0.049		9.25%		\$	1.55	\$	0.05	\$	0.13	\$	0.26	\$	3.10	\$	0.05	\$	10.42		8.85		
or and	N/A	0.054		9.90%	\$ 1.5 <u>1</u>	\$	1.72	\$	0.06	\$	0.16	\$	0.31	\$	3.44	\$	0.06	\$_	10.14		8.28		
			\$ 2.00			\$	3.44	\$	0.12	\$	0.31	\$	0.42	\$	4.68	\$	0.08	\$	8.32	\$	6.99		
	N/A	0.039		9.80%	\$ 1.51																- 1		
	····		\$0.00		<u> </u>	\$	1.24	_\$_	0.04	\$_	0.11	\$	0.22	\$	2.48	\$	0.04	\$	10.67	\$	9.34		
		ļ	\$ 2.00			\$	3.66	\$	0.13	\$	0.24	\$	0.33	\$	5.18	\$	0.09	\$	9.17	\$	7.99		
IÇO .	N/A	0.049		6.90%	\$ 1.51																		
Section 18			\$0.00			3	1.52	\$	0.05	\$	0.10	\$	0.20	\$_	3.04	\$	0.05	\$	10.82	\$	9.65		
			\$ 2.00			\$	3.56	\$	0.12	\$	0.25	\$	0.35	\$	4.96	\$	0.09	\$	8.95	\$	7.74		
Jr 🐪	N/A	0.045	to	7.70%	\$ 1.51	•															1		
			\$0.00	,, <u>-</u> ,		\$	1.41	\$	0.05	_\$_	0.10	\$	0.20	\$	2.81	\$	0.05	\$	10.79	\$	9.59		
			\$ 2.50			\$	4.31	\$	0.15	\$	0.39	\$	0.53	\$	5.87	\$	0.10	\$	7.34	\$	5.65		
let 📜		0.049	to	9.90%	\$ 1.51												ļ				j		
ilobel -	N/A		\$0.00			\$	1.56	\$	0.05	\$	0.14		0.28	\$	3.12	\$	0.05	\$			8.62		
itn See	N/A	0.069	\$0.00	12%	\$ 1.51	5	2.24	\$	0.08	\$	0.24	\$	0.48	\$	4.48	\$	0.08	\$	9.12	\$	6.24		